U.S. Patent Application No.	:	10/669,954
Filing Date	:	September 23, 2003
First Named Inventor	:	Anand P. Narayan
Title	:	Method and Apparatus for Selectively Applying Interference Cancellation in Spread Spectrum Systems
Date	:	January 16, 2008

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

AMENDMENT/ELECTION OF CLAIMS

Dear Sir:

This is a response to a Non Final Office Action mailed December 21, 2007. Claims 1-85 are pending in this Application.

In the Non-final office Action, the Examiner restricted group I claims 1-13, 14-18, 26-38,39-49,50-56,59,65-68 and Claim 73 to Class 375, subclass 148, and group II claims 19-25,57-58,60,61-64,69-72,75,77-79, 80-85 to Class 375, subclass 144.

Applicants firstly wish to point out that Claims 74 and Claims 75, pending in this application, were not classified in the Action into either of the Groups, as applicants pointed out to the Examiner during the telephonic conversation on January 2, 2008. Applicants infer from the dependencies of the Claims that Claim 74 is classified in group I and Claim 76 in group II, and are proceeding on that assumption.

Applicants argue that the restriction requirement is improper since the two inventions held to be unrelated by the Examiner, viz., interference cancellation and cancelling interfering signal paths for each of a plurality of demodulation fingers are related and constitute essential and related steps of the same invention.
Interference cancellation (the invention classified by the Examiner as group I) is effected in the invention disclosed in this application by cancelling interfering signal paths for each of a

plurality of demodulation fingers. The application contains numerous references (Figures 2 and 3, and page 9 of the Specification as filed, for example) to these two steps working together. Applicants therefore, believe that the restriction is improper, and wish to traverse the restriction requirement.

Applicants further argue that since the two steps are related, even if classified separately, the examination of the full set of Claims do not present an undue burden of examination.

Applicants further submit, that a more suitable restriction requirement, would constitute a group I constituting Claims 1-13, 26-38, 57-59, 61-74 and 80-85 addressing selecting paths for selectively applying interference cancellation, and group II constituting Claims 14-25, 39-56, 60, 75-79 addressing which of an interference cancelled signal stream or a raw signal stream to use for signal processing. Applicants would choose the Group I Claims proposed by the Applicants should the Examiner accept the Applicants' proposal.

Further, in order that the reply may be complete, Applicants elect the Group I claims as restricted by the Examiner in the event that the restriction is not traversed or the Applicants' proposed restriction not be accepted.

REMARKS

Sincerely,

/Anand P. Narayan/
Anand P. Narayan
USPTO Reg# 54,332
TensorComm, Inc.
1490 W. 121st Avenue, Suite 202
Westminster, CO 80234
Phone: 303-327-4076
Fax: 303-920-4796
anarayan@tensorcomm.com